



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,370	09/08/2000	Greerson G. McMullen	GEH-01-062	3577

52082 7590 12/05/2005

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.
INTERNATIONAL PATENT OPERATION
3135 EASTON TPKE. W3C
FAIRFIELD, CT 06826

EXAMINER

PORTER, RACHEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/658,370	MCMULLEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachel L. Porter	3626	

All Participants:

(1) Rachel L. Porter.

(2) Joseph Thomas, SPE.

Status of Application: Response to Non-Final rec'd

(3) William Zychlewicz, Reg. No. 51,366.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11/17 and 11/23/05

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential 112, 2nd issues in claims 1, 11, and 18 as amended on 8/17/2005.

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 11 and 18 in particular.

Prior art documents discussed:

Nickles et al (USPN 6144901); Gibbs (USPN 5836529); Pierro et al (USPN 6,301,531)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



JOSEPH THOMAS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed possible claim language to overcome current prior art rejection and place application in better condition for allowance. Suggested the removal of the first "at least one of phrase" in wherein clause of the "recommending business activities step of claim 1, or clarification of the wording to explain which alternatives are required and to avoid antecedent basis problems with dependent claims. Similar suggestions were made for claim 11 and claim 18. Also for claim 18, suggested to applicant correcting minor grammatical errors in the "automatically modify step," and including a step of transmitting the recommendations similar to that found in claim 11 to tie in the function central data center found in the preamble of claim 18. Advised applicant that all newly submitted amendments would be subject to an additional search.

In a follow up interview on 11/23/05, Examiners discussed additions problems with the claim language in claims 1-5, 8, 11, and 18 in response to the informal supplemental amendment sent to Examiner Porter on 11/21/05. Suggested further claim language suggestions to eliminate 112, 2nd issues, grammatical problems, and applicant's intent with use of specific language/phrases. Again, advised applicant that all newly submitted amendments would be subject to an additional search.